SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study
City of Alhambra Meeting Summary
June 4, 2009
6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTION

On June 4, 2009, Caltrans held a community meeting to inform community stakeholders about the SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study. The meeting took place at the City of Alhambra Civic Center and Library. Approximately 40 community members attended.

SR-710 Study Team members who attended included the following project management staff from Caltrans: Doug Failing, District Director for Caltrans District 7; Abdi Saghafi, SR-710 Tunnel Technical Study Project Manager; and Pratheep Piratheepan, Geotechnical Lead. Other Study Team members who participated in the meeting were: Yoga Chandran of CH2MHILL; Steve Dubnewych of Jacob Engineering; Bruce Shell of Earth Mechanics; Rebecca Barrantes and Glenda Silva of The Sierra Group (TSG); Rena Salcedo, Debbie Rusas and Joann Olora of GCAP Services; and Katherine Padilla, John Limon and Thelma Herrera, of Katherine Padilla & Associates.

MEETING FORMAT

The meeting began at 6:30 pm with an informal Open House. There were informational displays set up in the lobby that depicted a range of topics, including: The Study Background and Public Involvement Process; The Technical Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee, both of which provide Study oversight; research methodologies of The Exploration Program; examples of subsurface soil and rock samples that were being collected as part of the Study; and modern tunnel building techniques. The Open House format provided community members with the opportunity to ask questions and engage in one-to-one conversations with knowledgeable Study Team Members.

The audience was welcomed by Doug Failing, District Director for Caltrans District 7. He explained that the purpose of these meetings was to clarify the feasibility studies on tunneling in the San Gabriel Valley. He added that they were not doing an environmental document and hoped to clear up those misconceptions. Doug Failing recognized those who had attended the meeting, including: Steven Shaw, Vice Mayor of the City of Alhambra; Mary Chavez, Director of Public Works for the City of Alhambra; Lee Dolley, Technical Advisory Committee member; Mike Ten, Councilmember of City of South Pasadena and Dr. Stephen Placido, Mayor of City of Alhambra.

Mayor Placido welcomed everyone who attended the community meeting at the City of Alhambra Library. He explained that Caltrans was here to collect more data on the Feasibility Study; and that the City of Alhambra was anticipating some good results. He then handed the meeting over to Doug Failing of Caltrans who began the presentation portion of the meeting. Mr. Failing introduced Rebecca Barrantes, representing The Sierra Group, who provided an overview of the meeting and presentation.

Rebecca Barrantes explained that the audience would learn about the highway maintenance study and describe the Exploration Study that has been going on for several months. She noted, that as the public entered the library, they should have noticed the collection of core samples from less than 250 feet and further below the surface. Rebecca explained how we would engage in a two-way conversation and everyone could share their opinions during the Question & Answer component. She stressed the need to have more public participation and asked for any ideas to better communicate. She provided an overview of the meeting agenda, as well as a review of the ground rules for conduct during the Question & Answer period. Rebecca handed the meeting off to Caltrans Project Manager, Abdi Saghafi. Mr. Saghafi then introduced Caltrans staff, as well as the Technical and Outreach Team members present. Lastly, he noted that Ms. Julianne Hines from Councilman Portantino's office had just joined the meeting.

The Presentation portion of the meeting convened at approximately 7:10 p.m.

Steve Dubnewych and Yoga Chandran, part of the Study Team's geotechnical experts, then provided a PowerPoint presentation that described the Study purpose and process; geological factors and their influence on tunnels; modern tunnel systems in Madrid, Shanghai, and Paris; and The Exploration Program that is currently underway to determine subsurface soil, rock and other geological conditions within the Study Area. They also provided a summary of geotechnical testing performed in each of the 5 zones within the study area and identified Superfund sites in Zones 4 and 5.

Following the geotechnical presentation, Rebecca Barrantes reviewed the Exploration Program notification process, describing door-to-door outreach to neighborhoods adjacent to the exploration sites. The public involvement process for the Study was reviewed, indicating frequency and timeframe for Steering and Technical Advisory Committee meetings, Community meetings, newsletters, presentations, and reports. Upcoming Community and Committee meeting dates were provided. Finally, the Study information office location and contact number was provided.

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE

After the presentation, community members participated in a Question & Answer session. Mr. Saghafi and members of the Study Team listened, sometimes asking questions for clarification, and responded. Rebecca Barrantes facilitated the session. Topics discussed included: the cost of the Study, soil conditions of study zones; methodology related to selection of borings; and impacts of tunneling.

The questions and comments offered by community members appear below by category. *Responses from Caltrans Project Manager Mr. Saghafi and Study Team Members are italicized.*

Study Purpose

- Isn't the whole purpose of the SR-710 study to connect the SR-710 to the I-210?

We do not really have the scope of the project at this time. We are very limited in what we are doing and what we can respond to. We are looking for a connection. The I-210 is a possibility—yes. That is one of the reasons we are looking at all these areas. On the west, we have the I-5, and on the east, we have the I-605. Some of these may fall out, as we go through the process. The way the process is set up, we cannot pick and choose where we are going to connect to, until we go to the next phase.

Study Costs

- In trying to get a little more information on this project, I researched the internet and came upon a report from a financial planner, a "charette" done in December 5, 2007 regarding the financing. Is that document is still valid? Its conclusion is that to make this tunnel viable, it needs to be public-private partnership and that would involve $5 -$10 tolls for the tunnel. If that is true, seems to me, it would not to alleviate the traffic here in Alhambra. People would get off in Alhambra just to avoid the toll and keep the traffic just as bad and that for it to pay off, it would need freight—it would have to have many trucks. So, is this study still valid? Are those conclusions still what is planned? [Study was from USC Institute for Public Finance and Infrastructure Policy]

  We have not seen this study and cannot comment.

Research and Testing Methodology

- Do you know the soil conditions at the end of the 710 freeway?

  There are actually quite a few rock crops at the southern end and you can get good idea of what is down there by looking at the rocks, soil, and stuff at the surface. There is not one core sample in the back (of the room) that is exactly like the material found there but there are a couple of similar rock samples there, which are thin bedded mud stone shale.

- You distributed a handout that lists all the different cities where studies have been done. You mentioned Monterey Park, although I do not see Monterey Park listed. Do you want to address that?

  Our borings were located in certain cities and Monterey Park was not one of them. Borings were conducted in the cities of Alhambra, South Pasadena, Pasadena and Los Angeles. The Study [Factsheet] includes cities where borings were not conducted. We wanted to inform communities where borings where conducted of impacts of exploration activities. Mostly, the outreach was focused around such activities in the Exploration Program.

  NOTE: The Study Factsheet referred to in the question above lists all cities contained in the study area. Exploration activities, such as borings, were only conducted in certain cities.

Community meetings were held in all cities contained in the study area. Outreach was provided to both inform the community about the Exploration Program and upcoming community meetings

- So was this a typo? Did you have plans to conduct borings [in these areas]? And for what reason?

  If you are looking at the cities that are involved in the Study, Monterey Park is involved in the Study. They are at the table, and we did go out to Monterey Park last week with the same presentation to let the community know that the study is underway, that the Exploration Program has occurred and why.

- So let me get this straight, we need a connector from the SR-710 to the I-210, which is approximately 6 miles, and you are going out 20 miles one way, or 20 miles another way, or 15 miles a different way, to get from point A and B?

  The task we have presently is to look at all practical routes—it is the route neutral concept. This is a screening study and is not a design phase. During a screening, all possible outcomes are considered. We are looking at all possible outcomes at this point to see what conditions exist. If this project is to move forward, we would look at what is most favorable, what is the most likely route, and what are the implications of that. Some routes may fall out in the process. Like any other project we are involved with, we look at a number of options in the beginning, and may start with as many as 60 to 70, and get it down to 3 during the screening process. This is the initial step in the process. We are looking at all possible alternatives, so that no one will come back and say that we did not consider all possibilities at some later stage. That could set us back a few years. We are hoping, by doing this study, it will allow Caltrans and Metro to move forward and answer the questions that were raised.

- In which [committee] meetings were the boring locations actually selected? I have gone through all of the minutes available? There is no point at which somebody says, we recommended the following boring locations. Who selected the boring locations? Why were they selected? When were they [meetings] done? Were [boring locations] verified?

  The boring locations were chosen between Caltrans and technical consultant, CH2M Hill. These locations were presented to the Technical Advisory and Steering Committees in October of 2008. That is on record, and I think we can provide that record. Those boring locations were selected based on available data, type of geology, the formations, fault zones, and various factors.

- Who will do the screening of boring data and when?

The screening of boring data will be completed by Caltrans. It is the technical team's responsibility to provide Caltrans with information, from technical and geological perspectives, on each of the zones. Caltrans and Metro would then use that information and possibly conduct other studies to compliment that screening further down. We will also utilize input from the Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee. Ultimately, the final decision on the screening alternatives will be made by Caltrans.

Borings

- You bored in 5 zones. Wouldn't we be more concerned with only Zone 3? That is where the tunnel [should be]. What is the use of drilling in all other zones?

  We have tried very hard to develop the scope of this technical study, and as we went through it, the decision was made that the study should be route neutral. Congressman Schiff has allocated some funds towards the study, and one of the specific requests has been to ensure that we stay route neutral. We do not have any preference on any on these zones. At this point, we are focused on these geotechnical studies. As we go through the next phase, we will narrow down these studies and decide which one would be chosen. Unfortunately, the scope of the study is very limited.

- Were all the borings done north of Valley Boulevard? Should we assume that the tunnel will start north of Valley Boulevard because you have not done any testing in the south? If that is the case, it is going to take a long distance before you bore down to start a portal. How will that affect the community?

  If the tunnel were to be built, it is likely that it would be from the south. At the northern end of the SR-710 freeway, there is plenty of room leading into Valley Boulevard. We would take the entrance to the tunnel as far back possible, considering the geometry and space available. For tunneling in the portal area, we would go down fairly steep grading, 4% to 6%, for a short distance. We could get this down in order to minimize or eliminate any impact before the railroad tracks. We have not put this down on paper to determine if the distance is adequate, or if the geometry works. That would be a future study. The goal would be to minimize and eliminate the impact to communities, if possible.

- Have you done borings in places south of Valley Boulevard?

  We have not because we are looking at this from a tunneling perspective, not from a portal standpoint. Our focus has been to look at subsurface conditions with respect to tunnel feasibility. Another focus is to characterize the type of material we may encounter, so that we can use that to look at formations, and determine if the formations would be similar. We are trying to get a general pattern at this stage. In the future, we will go into much more detail.

- Why can't you complete borings south of Valley Boulevard during this study?

  This is a Technical Study. We cannot go outside the scope of the study by looking at that. This is a screening study and we are covering a very wide area. Consequently, we cannot complete borings at every location. Some of the data we need for certain areas is already available. Based on what we find out, if we go through to the environmental phase, then we will screen and narrow down the alternatives. We can't do all the borings that we want, and find out later, it was not necessary. So, I think it behooves us to delay that until the environmental phase.

- If you do not include borings south of Valley Boulevard in the study, then you will have to go back and do them at the time of an EIR. Are these borings not a part of your plan?

  We will do more borings as a part of the environmental process. We will have to.

- There a lot of rock crops south of Valley Boulevard, yet there are no borings south of Valley Boulevard. You would normally have a boring, even if it is 10, 20 or 50 feet. Are there any geological studies done right now for the exposed rock south of Valley, basically under the Cal State Los Angeles?

  When the report finally comes out, it will show that there are 300- 400 borings within these areas that are a part of this study. There are a variety of borings from existing sources. I do not know what the exact number is but we are compiling that data now.

- Looking at those resolutions on screen right now: You have three borings in Zone 1 between Alhambra Road and Mission Road. That sort of density verses the south would indicate that you have a lot of existing information south of that. Can you comment on this?

  These drawings were put together before we started the exploration activities and they show proposed borings. Some of the actual locations of the borings have changed. If you look at the colors on the map, for example in Zone 1, there are some large areas that are within the same formation. There were approximately seven borings in Zone 1. The borings verified that this area generally consisted of the same materials. Like any investigation, we must start broad and narrow down. If it gets to the point where a couple of zones are selected, more borings will be done, and we can begin to fill in the details.

- Will there be any existing borings or geological records completed to include Valley Boulevard?

That is not currently part of our scope. The scope includes Valley Boulevard, at the northern end of the SR-710, and areas that fan out from it as represented by the zones. Additional investigations would need to be conducted if it were eventually decided to begin the portal further south.

Please be reminded that this is a screening study and not a design. The information you are seeking is critical during a design phase, where it is necessary to look into all the details. As a part of the screening, we are looking from a high level, at what would be expected and how can we use that to provide screening results. These questions are extremely valued, and need to be looked at, if we move forward and as we move forward.

- Were all the borings done to a consistent depth of testing of 250 feet?

  The depth of the borings ranged from 200-500 feet. It should be noted that the depths of the borings and the range do not in any way indicate the depth of the tunnel itself. Borings are conducted only to determine the types of geological formations.

Tunnel

- What depth do you need to achieve to start boring the tunnel?

  The location of the portals have not been determined at this point; however we would like to have a depth of approximately 50 feet and then go down deeper. If we do not have a sufficient amount of depth, we would typically sink a shaft to get deeper. Ramps leading into and out of the tunnel would have some bearing on this process. Again, if we do not have sufficient depth, for example if there are some sensitive structures above it, we could most likely sink a shaft.

- What would be the minimum depth needed (for a tunnel) at the shallow end, and the bottom?

  It is difficult to tell because it depends on the ground conditions. If we got really competent material, like rock, we could probably go shallower. If we got alluvium soils and underneath the ground water table, we would probably want to get deeper. There are a lot of things to take into consideration. We have not looked at this yet.

- If there were homes above ground, at level, what would your estimate be in terms the effect of tunneling?

  We cannot answer that at this time because we have not looked at that. That will be more than an issue of the portals; it will be an issue along the entire alignment as well.

- If you had considered Z1B8, where you have the location of the boring, to be the portal entry, would that disrupt any of the railroads?

  It is not likely that boring Z1B8 would be the portal entry. The portal entry would be further south. How far south is probably a part of a future study; however it would not go much more south of that.

- I live on the borderline of Alhambra and Los Angeles. Is the tunnel expected to be 200 feet below ground? If it does go under my house, what about the vibrations or what about any cracks in the house [during construction]?

  There have been tunnels built in urban environments in many cities. A couple of years ago, we tunneled in the City of Los Angeles and East Los Angeles- the East Project. Just recently, we did the Gold Line extension. These tunnels were constructed successfully, even at much shallower depths, with no settlement at all. In terms of vibration, you may hear noise from the tunneling machines. If it was an issue, it could be an inconvenience for no more than two or three days because these machines excavate 40 feet a day on average. That would be the worst case scenario.

- My concern is that it was said these were going to be ventilated with fans. The diesel fumes and the gas fumes have to go somewhere. In the original artist rendering, there were ventilation stacks coming out at different intervals. I think in 10 feet intervals. What is going to happen with the BOCs that are admitted in stacks, even though you have fan ventilation?

  I think that you are referring to the study done by Metro in 2006. I believe there was a ventilation concept where they used stacks. That is just one way of ventilating tunnels. We have not looked at the ventilation requirements. There are other methods for ventilating tunnels. For example, you could have vent ducks within the tunnel that are traveling just above the cars. You may also have a ventilation system that may not even require any vent stacks, similar to an example provided in the presentation. That will be looked at if we go to the next phase of the project. In that situation, you would not have a vent stack. Instead, all of the emissions would be at the end of the tunnel and that is where they would have to use scrubbers to clean up the air to safe levels before it is emitted into atmosphere. That technology is always evolving and there is new technology. I am not a ventilation expert, but that is just another option. Ventilation systems do not have to necessarily include stacks.

- When the tunnel was first proposed, more that 6 years ago, the model that was being used was the Paris model, I was really interested to see some of the pictures today, particularly the model that shows the ability to put both trains and passenger cars. I realize it is early, but are there any indications that any of the soils and the samples we took might support that possible option?

Again, it is too soon to tell. I should mention that all questions will be documented. If we move forward to the next phase, all of these questions will be answered and will be taken into consideration.

- Would these tunnels be a direct connection from the end of the SR-710 to which ever portal option you pick? Would there be no off-ramps or on-ramps in between those two locations? Is that what we are looking at, at this time?

  The scope of the study is too limited to provide an answer. We do not know if there will be off ramps or interchanges.

- Most of the tunnel could be designed to have the top of the tunnel at 100 feet below surface and have a 50 feet diameter. So we could have a 150 feet diameter. Basically, the southern most boring in the zone closest to the SR-710 freeway shows that if it is a feasible boring, then the tunnel could be a 100 feet below surface at that point. This does justify that the portal could come up and could be well south of Valley Boulevard.

  Normally, the formula that is followed is two tunnel diameters below the surface and the top of the tunnel, so it does add up to your numbers. That is the general rule of thumb. We can go shallower, depending on what is up top.

- While all this construction is going on, there is going to be constant of traffic and you are going to have to discharge all that material that is dug out of the tunnel. How long is this process going to take, more or less?

  It depends on which one we go with. Typically, you can excavate 40 feet per day and if you have one machine coming each end, you could double that rate. The excavation part, depending on the type of tunnel, could last 2 years or 3 years.

- The residents living near the tunnel are going to be constantly involved in the traffic, noise and that is not going to go away for whatever length of time it takes to build the tunnel. I would imagine that they would have a constant flow of traffic during construction and they are not going to pile dirt outside and then take it out later.

  There will have to be mitigation requirements implemented to minimize the effects to communities. This is not the first tunnel built in a city environment. There will have to be sound laws; for example there might be restricted work time slots, silencers on equipment. The mitigation efforts put in place will be looked during the environmental process. There would be mud-hauling trucks utilized. We could consider different routes [for hauling these materials]. We could also benefit from researching portal studies where there is no host that is impacted.

- It looks like you are going across ground water in a couple of places. Are you anticipating that that is going to be a problem? Is that an aquifer? It was mentioned in one of the other meetings that there were issues with the Redline. It looks like one of the openings is near ground water. In a couple of areas, you are really close to ground water by the proposal for the tunnel. Has that been addressed? Will there be reinforcement? Also the [material] below the tunnel looks a lot like silky shields, which may be a problem environmentally. Even when not considering this material from an environmental standpoint, it is not a very stable substrate. Is that being addressed?

  There are hundreds of projects where there is construction under groundwater tables. There is technology to deal with that. In terms of the shields and mudstones, we've tunneled in Los Angeles and have successfully constructed tunnels in that sort of condition as well. We don't anticipate any sort of problem there either.

- You had mentioned that you were not sure if you would have two machines or just one. So you quoted that it would take 2 years to construct a tunnel. Is that for two machines or one?

  The estimate of 2 years or 3 years would probably be with two machines. A lot of these projects depend on what dictates the schedule. That will be the driver and how fast they need excavated these tunnels. It will be a cost exercise that will addressed later, when we go down that path.

Other

- Who decides that the whole project will move forward? Is it the State Legislator, Metro or the staff of Caltrans?

  It could be any particular entity, such as Caltran's Transportation Commission, the governor's office, Metro; any of those entities can make the decision. It could be Caltrans moving forward.

- Will any of the proposed tunnel alternatives alleviate traffic problems through Alhambra caused by the SR-710 freeway ending at Valley Boulevard?

  The scope of this study if fairly limited. It is limited to analyzing geotechnical and geological issues. Due to this, we have not done any traffic studies to determine if an alternative can be chosen and potential impact to surrounding traffic. The simple answer is "we don't know."

- If the tunnel is not built what would Caltrans do to fix the traffic problems caused by the SR-710 freeway?

  As you may be aware, there are some local projects that have been completed in the area related to this. I believe they may be completed, with the exception of one maybe. If the tunnel is not built, the only alternative would be to work with local entities to reconfigure and direct the traffic differently.

- There are many old homes in our city; some are over 90 years old. If we were to sustain quite a bit of damage to our house, who would pay for it?

  When we are close to the design phase, we would ensure that the settlement and equipment used would minimize any sort of damage. To have no damage at all would be our goal. Depending on the ground conditions, we could choose alignments that are much better and conducive to tunneling to minimizing surface disturbance. Tunnels have been constructed in even much more shallow conditions and they have caused no damage at all. If there is damage, the contractor is required to have insurance to cover this.

- You mentioned that there was contaminated water at a certain level, but you are going below that level. Can you explain how you will do this?

  Contaminated ground water is encountered in Zones 4 and 5. The top of contaminated ground water is 50 feet below and the groundwater goes down 150 to 200 feet deeper. The tunnel would most likely go through the contaminated water within these zones. We would have to study that in more detail if it is chosen for a zone for tunneling. Initially, it is my expectation and observation that most likely, the tunnel will penetrate through the contaminated ground water.

- Will this presentation (the PowerPoint) be made available on the website at some point? I am especially interested in the drawings and maps of the geological zones?

  Yes, the complete presentation will be available on the website, with maps and drawings.

- You told us a little bit about the ground water in Zones 4 and 5. Are there any other conclusions that you have come to because of this? Are there any other implications?

  The reason that groundwater has been a topic is because it does have implications. We are looking at all the data we have collected and are waiting for some results to come in. If we were to present groundwater information now, it would be based on partially collected data or results. It will take us another couple of weeks to get all the data, and following that,

another month to complete an evaluation. At that point, we will have a better idea of what the conditions and impacts are.

- Will the ground water information be posted on the website?

  When the findings come through, we will initially submit the report to Caltrans and Metro. We do have periodic updates to the Technical Advisory Committee and Steering Committee, and all of those will posted on the website. The Technical Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee meetings are open to the public.

- I want to apologize in advance for not asking a geo-technical question. My understanding is, in order to finance this project, a public-private partnership is going to be necessary to build and operate it as a toll road. Since that generally cannot be done under California law, senate bill 1350 is required for this project to go through. I would like to know why senate bill 1350 specifies a design- build for procurement processes with no competitive bidding. I would also like to know why S.B. 1350 exempts contract questionnaires from the public records act.

  Caltrans does not comment on legislation.

- What are the mortality rates around portal tunnels? Can you direct me to research studies that show mortality rates around portal tunnels and also around scrubbers? There must be a human cost benefit, a human toll that will happen if this project is completed.

  We do not have information to address this question.

- If all the tunneling in the world and all the machines stopped today, is there a machine available to start cutting into this project? Is there a machine being built right now? Is there one already ready to go? Is there any machine available right now to start the drilling tomorrow?

  A project like this would typically require a custom built machine for the conditions expected. The procurement process would likely take a year or a year and a half to build one of these machines. There are large machines that could have been designed for different tunneling rock conditions, as you have seen some of the examples provided. We would not recommend using a machine from another project for different conditions of a project like this. A lot of times, depending on a project's conditions, unique specifications are needed and would require a brand new machine, as opposed to an existing machine.

- There was a report you mentioned earlier, the Feasibility Study that came out in 2006. It stated that the portal would start on Concord and Alhambra Avenue. I do not know if this is something that is still being considered because so far, you have not tested anything below

that. I would assume that you are going to continue and if you are planning to start a portal right at that spot. If so, that would mean that you would have to cut a cover at least 8,000 feet before you start a portal. It would mean that you would take all the homes north of that. Is it a possibility that somehow you could make a change on that? If you back up to the I-10 and start the portal back there, then you would not affect those homes plus you would go under Valley Boulevard and under the railroad track without having to build a bridge. Is that an option?

As we go forward into the environmental phase, we will look at all possible options. I can assure that, like any project that Caltrans completes, the ultimate goal is to minimally impact property and afford maximum benefits to the local communities as far as air quality improvements. I can tell you that as the department manager for Vice SR-710 South, those are the ultimate goals for that project. I can assure you as this project goes forward, those will be the goals.

- Can I assume that you are not using the [Metro] Feasibility Study any longer?

  The Feasibility Study Metro did in 2006 was only the first step and it was very general. They only conducted three borings, and we conducted more borings and additional tests. The Metro Study was a foundation to start from, but we are not mimicking that study.

- [Testing south of Valley Boulevard] is a big criteria and I think it needs to be addressed before you go into the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) phase. If you go into an EIR without resolving this, you are going to hold this up even longer. It may cost the tax payers a lot more money.

  The way the process is set up, and what we follow for all our projects, is that it is only during the EIR that we start narrowing down alternatives, do a cost benefit analysis, and look at the impact of traffic (local traffic as well as freeway traffic). We are bound by that. Legally, we cannot go into those issues until we are in the environmental phase. I want to assure you that we will address all those concerns during the environmental process.

COMMENTS:

- You are testing 15 miles between the south portal to the I-605. The cost of that must be 50 million dollars. Why even consider it, if you cannot afford it? Why not study the south side and forget about that?

- I think that there is going to be a tunnel and its going to be public-private partnership. I do not know where they are going to get the public money from because if there are tolls, there will be truck and cars that refuse to go into the tunnel to pay the toll. If the toll rate

on trucks is $4.00, twenty-five of those truckers will not go into the tunnel. If the toll rate is $5.00, thirty percent will not go into the tunnel. If the toll rate if $6.00, thirty-five percent of the truckers will not go into the tunnel. If it is a $7.00 toll, forty percent of the truckers will not use the tunnel. We are talking about 300,000 cars and trucks a day, forty percent of those trucks will not go into the tunnel and would instead be diverted. Where will they be diverted to? They will be diverted to Fremont Avenue. As far as the interchange at Huntington Drive, that was rejected. I don't know why you are still studying it; it was rejected by Metro in the feasibility report because San Marino said they would not support that.

- The community and the residents that are closest to the portal are the ones who will be affected during construction. I am hoping that they could come out with something that is satisfactory to the residents or you are going to be hearing a lot of complaints. If you live 2 or 3 blocks from there, and this is going on at night, some people will be sensitive to noise.

NEXT STEPS

The meeting concluded at approximately 8:23 pm. At the meeting conclusion, Community Outreach Manager Rebecca Barrantes thanked the community of Alhambra for their participation and assured them that they would be kept informed throughout the Study.